REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8 and 10-18 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 8 and 15 being the independent claims, and Claims 2, 4, 7 and 9 being cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0068586) in view of Virtanen (U.S. Pat. No.6,249,681) further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,216).

Claims 8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun et al. in view of Virtanen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,681).

Claims 1, 6, 8, 10 and 15 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that Chun et al. in view of Virtanen and further in view of Kim et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, an automatic call connection method for a first mobile communication terminal, the method comprising storing call information for a setup call during initial call setup; determining when call drop occurs during the setup call, and whether the call drop was unintentional; and automatically reconnecting a previous call between the first terminal and a second mobile communication terminal, i.e., the dropped call, *the automatic reconnection being conditional solely on determination of the call drop being unintentional.*

Chun et al. discloses a call connection method for a first mobile communication terminal 50, the method comprising storing call information for a setup call during initial call setup; determining when call drop occurs during the setup call, and whether the call drop was unintentional; and reconnecting a previous call between the first terminal and a second mobile communication terminal, i.e., the dropped call (FIGs. 1 and 6-7). The reconnection for the drop call in Chun et al. is conditional on a request manually input by a mobile phone subscriber for a call reconnection (paragraphs 0069 and 0084, step 102 in FIG. 8a). Independent Claim 1 of Chun et al. reasserts the condition of the request manually input by a subscriber in reciting in the first step of a method of reconnecting as "sending a reconnection request signal by the MS

subscriber . . . ." Chun et al. is silent about the limitation of *the automatic reconnection being conditional solely on determination of the drop call being unintentional* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Virtanen discloses an automatic call connection method for a first mobile communication terminal 10, the method comprising storing call information for a setup call during initial call setup; determining when call drop occurs during the setup call, and whether the call drop was unintentional; and automatically reconnecting a previous call between the first terminal and a second mobile communication terminal, i.e., the dropped call (FIGs. 2 and 4-5B). The reconnection for the drop call in Virtanen is conditional on two conditions: determination of the unintentional drop call, and further on the detection that "either the mobile station or base station/MSC has packet data to transmit that belongs to the released call" (col. 4 lines 44-47, col. 10 lines 48-51, col. 11 lines 5-7, and independent Claim 1). Virtanen fails to disclose the limitation of *the automatic reconnection being conditional solely on determination of the call being drop unintentional* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Chun et al.

Kim et al. discloses an automatic call connection method for a first mobile communication terminal 50, the method comprising storing call information for a setup call during initial call setup; determining when call drop occurs during the setup call, and whether the call drop was unintentional; and automatically reconnecting a previous call between the first terminal and a second mobile communication terminal, i.e., the dropped call (FIGs. 1-5). The reconnection for the drop call in Kim et al. is conditional on two conditions: determination of the unintentional drop call, and further on the detection of re-connection paging request (FIG. 4 step 406, FIG. 5 step 510, col. 6 lines 29-50). Kim et al. is silent about the limitation of *the automatic reconnection being conditional solely on determination of the call drop being unintentional* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Chun et al., Virtanen, Kim et al., or any combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 15 with respect to Chun et al., Virtanen, Kim et al., or any combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 8 with respect to Chun et al., Virtanen, or the combination thereof.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, all of the claims pending in the application, namely, Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8 and 10-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk